

REMARKS

The Office Action has been received and reviewed. In light of the above amendments and following remarks, Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Claims 1, 5-7, 9-15, 20, 22-23, 25, and 28-29 are currently pending in the application. Claim 4 is canceled.

Claims 1, 4-6, 20-22, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madour (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0053431) in view of Bertrand et al. (U.S. Patent 6,876,640).

Claim 1 is directed to a wireless communication device (e.g. a handset) having “a corresponding timer, wherein the processor removes the connection identifier from the connection table in response to an expiration of the corresponding timer; wherein the processor resets the corresponding timer in response to activity on a connection corresponding to the connection identifier.” (Claim 1, Claims 20 and 28 contain similar limitations) Hence, the present claims require the use of “a connection table” and “a corresponding timer” in the handset.

The Examiner cites Bertrand at column 9, lines 1-38 to meet this limitation. (Office Action page 3) However, Bertrand recites “upon expiration of the R-P connection, the PDSN 120(2) sends a Remove Entry message 314 to the PPP register 126(1), which message directs the PPP register 126(1) to remove the PPP context from its database.” (Column 9, lines 6-9) Hence, Bertrand actually discloses a timer to expire an R-P connection between a radio network (RN) and the PDSN; rather than the Air interface between the MS and the RN (which is analogous to the present invention’s connection). (see Figure 1) Bertrand also discloses removing the expired R-P connection from the PPP register which is clearly separate from the mobile station 102(1). Whereas, the present invention requires the connection table and the timer to be in the handset (mobile station). In other words, Bertrand is actually an example of prior art systems distinguished in the background section of the present application.

Accordingly, for at least this reason, Madour and Bertrand fail to obviate the present invention and the rejected claims should now be allowed.

Claims 7, 9-15, 23, 25, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertrand in view of Madour II (U.S. Patent No. 6,834,050).

The present claims recite “wherein a first timer in the PDSN and a second timer in the wireless communication device correspond to each of the connections and wherein the first timer is set to expire after the second timer.” (Claims 7, 23 and 29) Hence, the present claims require a first timer in the PDSN and a second timer in the handset.

The Examiner cites Madour II (at column 3, lines 37-54 and column 6, lines 27-50) to meet this limitation. (Office Action page 7) However, Madour II simply discloses the use of a cache timer 49 which resides in the PCF 42. (See Figure 2) Madour II does not disclose a first timer in the PDSN or a second timer in the mobile network as required in the present claims. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Bertrand and Madour II fail to obviate the present invention and the rejected claims should be allowed.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 12, 2008

By: /Darren M. Simon, Reg. No. 47,946/

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502

Darren M. Simon, Reg. No. 47,946
(858) 845-2472